



Re: FW: Contaminated soil used for restoration
Sonya Pennock to: DC Orr
Cc: Rebecca Thomas, Sean Earle, Carol Campbell, Victor Ketellapper

1258933 - R8 SDMS

03/07/2011 08:46 AM

We are drafting a response to your question about the soil placed by EPA on OU1.

Sonya Pennock
Office of Communications & Public Involvement
US/EPA Region 8
1595 Wynkoop Street
Denver, CO 80202-1129
Phone: 303-312-6600

DC Orr	Dear EPA;	03/07/2011 08:32:12 AM
--------	-----------	------------------------

From: DC Orr <xcav8orr@hotmail.com>
To: Rebecca Thomas/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Sonya Pennock/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Sean Earle/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Carol Campbell/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, <barbdesch@gmail.com>, <bigskylawyer@yahoo.com>, Bill Bischoff <billb@libby.org>, Doug Roll <dproll@yahoo.com>, <jim.hammons@cityoflibby.com>, Peggy Williams <flourgardener@yahoo.com>, <robinsdesk@yahoo.com>, vicky lawrence <montanavicky@gmail.com>
Date: 03/07/2011 08:32 AM
Subject: FW: Contaminated soil used for restoration

Dear EPA;

This question has been asked repeatedly for quite some time. It is relative to the bigger question that started when ER got a CURE notice for not using filters on decon water at the minesite. Actually, we had been asking questions about the filters for YEARS before the CURE notice.

The big issue is this; how can the EPA contractors, with Paul Peronards 12 layers of EPA oversight, continually and repeatedly violate the RAWP in such important areas as decon, soil testing, alcohol and drug abuse on the job, transportation of hazardous materials, and documentation?

These protocols are put in place to protect human health, just because EPA refuses to do the tox studies doesn't mean this stuff isn't toxic.

Can someone please let me know you are putting effort into answering the question of delivery of contaminated soil on OU-1.

From: xcav8orr@hotmail.com
To: ketellapper.victor@epa.gov; thomas.rebecca@epamail.epa.gov; earle.sean@epamail.epa.gov; campbell.carol@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: FW: Contaminated soil used for restoration
Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2011 10:05:34 -0700

Ms. Thomas;

I talked to Mr. Kettelapper today and he was going to facilitate an answer to this set of questions.

Thanks, DC Orr

From: xcav8orr@hotmail.com

To: thomas.rebecca@epamail.epa.gov; earle.sean@epamail.epa.gov; campbell.carol@epamail.epa.gov

Subject: FW: Contaminated soil used for restoration

Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2011 07:10:10 -0700

Ms. Thomas;

As we move forward on work at OU-1 I think it will become increasingly important that EPA give the Council an explanation on how the heck contaminated soil was delivered to OU-1 in violation of protocols set up in the RAWP.

I would request that you reveal which contractor delivered the contaminated material to OU-1 and the source of that soil and it's reason for being contaminated so that we can be sure to not make the same mistake when we do the Restoration work. (IF we do the Restoration work) It is also important that the Council know why oversight failed to hold the contractor to the protocols set up to protect human health.

Please respond and understand that this response is going to generate more questions, especially concerning the topsoil used in previous action on OU-1 which was obtained from the floodplain by the Kootenai River just downstream from Rainy Creek. This comment was ignored in the ROD.

Sincerely, DC Orr

From: xcav8orr@hotmail.com

To: filmwest@gmail.com; gordsull@yahoo.com; perquiaga@eaglesvoice.com; five_rivers@ymail.com

Subject: FW: Contaminated soil used for restoration

Date: Thu, 29 Jul 2010 16:50:27 -0600

Folks;

There is an important lesson in the following exchange. When I called Mike Cirian to ask him if the contaminated material I was reading about was dumped on OU-1, his verbal response was a simple NO.

Once I asked the same question in writing, he changes my first verbal question, and then actually answers that YES, INDEED, ASSUREDLY EPA did cross contaminate OU-1.

Why do any of us bother calling these folks? Email them and develop a public record we can use against them later.

Note that he did not respond to the questions of public safety and did not deny that their contractors are still violating their protocols with impunity. The Removal Action Work Plan means nothing if it is not enforced.

As usual, DC

> Subject: Re: Contaminated soil used for restoration
> To: xcav8orr@hotmail.com
> CC: Murray.Bill@epamail.epa.gov; Thomas.Rebecca@epamail.epa.gov;
Ketellapper.Victor@epamail.epa.gov; Pennock.Sonya@epamail.epa.gov; glena.young@cityoflibby.com;
Earle.Sean@epamail.epa.gov; RSloan@mt.gov; Linnert.Ted@epamail.epa.gov;
Wharton.Steve@epamail.epa.gov; jim.hammons@cityoflibby.com
> From: Cirian.Mike@epamail.epa.gov
> Date: Thu, 29 Jul 2010 12:45:10 -0600

> Mr. Orr,

> You asked on the telephone conversation if we used the topsoil that had
> a hit for trace LA at OU1, My answer was no and you asked for that in
> writing (we did not use any topsoil at OU1).

> Your question below asks can I assure you that soil used to cover
> visible vermiculite was not from the contaminated source you were
> reading about. I can not as some of the laydown material used to cover
> the visible vermiculite was from the laydown material that had one
> sample come back at a trace result. The material used at OU1 with the
> trace result is however behind the construction barrier fence in areas
> that are going to be addressed as part of the remedial actions for OU1
> in which we are coordinating our actions along with the cities new plans
> for the site. Material (Common fill) placed outside the orange fencing
> is material that was tested and was non-detect for LA.

> Mike Cirian

> Contaminated soil used for restoration

> DC Orr

> to:

> Mike Cirian

> 07/28/2010 12:00 PM

> Mr. Cirian;

- > Just a quick followup to our phone conversation this morning.
- > I have been reading that EPA allowed their contractors to violate
- > protocols included in the Removal Action Work Plan and this resulted in
- > material being delivered to restoration projects that contained low
- > levels of Libby Amphibole. This contaminated soil was spread out on
- > several sites.
- > I have witnessed EPA contractor crews dumping quite a bit of soil at
- > OU-1 recently. Fences have also been erected at various spots on this
- > site seemingly without any specific criteria. It has been a very
- > willy-nilly program.
- > Can you assure me that the soil used to temporarily cover visible
- > vermiculite that has laid in the open for years at OU-1 was not the
- > contaminated restoration or cover material that I have been reading
- > about?
- > If it is, what are the ramifications for public safety in this public
- > park to exposed contaminant blowing in the wind?
- > Thank you for your consideration of this important matter.
- > Sincerely, Councilman DC Orr; (Public Safety Coordinator)
- >
- > The New Busy think 9 to 5 is a cute idea. Combine multiple calendars
- > with Hotmail. Get busy.
- >

The New Busy is not the too busy. Combine all your e-mail accounts with Hotmail. Get busy.



FW: Contaminated soil used for restoration

DC Orr

to:

Rebecca Thomas, Sonya Pennock, Sean Earle, Carol Campbell, barbdesch, bigskylawyer, Bill Bischoff, Doug Roll, jim.hammons, Peggy Williams, robinsdesk, vicky lawrence

03/07/2011 08:32 AM

Show Details

Dear EPA;

This question has been asked repeatedly for quite some time. It is relative to the bigger question that started when ER got a CURE notice for not using filters on decon water at the minesite. Actually, we had been asking questions about the filters for YEARS before the CURE notice.

The big issue is this; how can the EPA contractors, with Paul Peronards 12 layers of EPA oversight, continually and repeatedly violate the RAWP in such important areas as decon, soil testing, alcohol and drug abuse on the job, transportation of hazardous materials, and documentation?

These protocols are put in place to protect human health, just because EPA refuses to do the tox studies doesn't mean this stuff isn't toxic.

Can someone please let me know you are putting effort into answering the question of delivery of contaminated soil on OU-1.

From: xcav8orr@hotmail.com

To: ketellapper.victor@epa.gov; thomas.rebecca@epamail.epa.gov; earle.sean@epamail.epa.gov; campbell.carol@epamail.epa.gov

Subject: FW: Contaminated soil used for restoration

Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2011 10:05:34 -0700

Ms. Thomas;

I talked to Mr. Kettellapper today and he was going to facilitate an answer to this set of questions.

Thanks, DC Orr

From: xcav8orr@hotmail.com

To: thomas.rebecca@epamail.epa.gov; earle.sean@epamail.epa.gov; campbell.carol@epamail.epa.gov

Subject: FW: Contaminated soil used for restoration

Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2011 07:10:10 -0700

Ms. Thomas;

As we move forward on work at OU-1 I think it will become increasingly important that EPA give the Council an explanation on how the heck contaminated soil was delivered to OU-1 in

violation of protocols set up in the RAWP.

I would request that you reveal which contractor delivered the contaminated material to OU-1 and the source of that soil and it's reason for being contaminated so that we can be sure to not make the same mistake when we do the Restoration work. (IF we do the Restoration work) It is also important that the Council know why oversite failed to hold the contractor to the protocols set up to protect human health.

Please respond and understand that this response is going to generate more questions, especially concerning the topsoil used in previous action on OU-1 which was obtained from the floodplain by the Kootenai River just downstream from Rainy Creek. This comment was ignored in the ROD.

> Sincerely, DC Orr

From: xcav8orr@hotmail.com

To: filmwest@gmail.com; gordsull@yahoo.com; perquiaga@eaglesvoice.com; five_rivers@ymail.com

Subject: FW: Contaminated soil used for restoration

Date: Thu, 29 Jul 2010 16:50:27 -0600

> Folks;

> There is an important lesson in the following exchange. When I called Mike Cirian to ask him if the contaminated material I was reading about was dumped on OU-1, his verbal response was a simple NO.

> Once I asked the same question in writing, he changes my first verbal question, and then actually answers that YES, INDEED, ASSUREDLY EPA did cross contaminate OU-1.

> Why do any of us bother calling these folks? Email them and develop a public record we can use against them later.

> Note that he did not respond to the questions of public safety and did not deny that their contractors are still violating their protocols with impunity. The Removal Action Work Plan means nothing if it is not enforced.

> As usual, DC

> Subject: Re: Contaminated soil used for restoration

> To: xcav8orr@hotmail.com

> CC: Murray.Bill@epamail.epa.gov; Thomas.Rebecca@epamail.epa.gov; Ketellapper.Victor@epamail.epa.gov; Pennock.Sonya@epamail.epa.gov; glena.young@cityoflibby.com; Earle.Sea@epamail.epa.gov; RSloan@mt.gov; Linnert.Ted@epamail.epa.gov; Wharton.Steve@epamail.epa.gov; jim.hammons@cityoflibby.com

> From: Cirian.Mike@epamail.epa.gov

> Date: Thu, 29 Jul 2010 12:45:10 -0600

>

> Mr. Orr,

>

> You asked on the telephone conversation if we used the topsoil that had

> a hit for trace LA at OU1, My answer was no and you asked for that in

> writing (we did not use any topsoil at OU1).

>

> Your question below asks can I assure you that soil used to cover

> visible vermiculite was not from the contaminated source you were

> reading about. I can not as some of the laydown material used to cover

> the visible vermiculite was from the laydown material that had one

> sample come back at a trace result. The material used at OU1 with the

> trace result is however behind the construction barrier fence in areas

> that are going to be addressed as part of the remedial actions for OU1

> in which we are coordinating our actions along with the cities new plans

> for the site. Material (Common fill) placed outside the orange fencing
 > is material that was tested and was non-detect for LA.
 >
 >
 > Mike Cirian
 >
 >
 >
 >
 >
 >
 >
 >
 > Contaminated soil used for restoration
 >
 >
 > DC Orr
 > to:
 > Mike Cirian
 > 07/28/2010 12:00 PM
 >
 >
 >
 >
 >
 >
 >
 >
 > Mr. Cirian;
 > Just a quick followup to our phone conversation this morning.
 > I have been reading that EPA allowed their contractors to violate
 > protocols included in the Removal Action Work Plan and this resulted in
 > material being delivered to restoration projects that contained low
 > levels of Libby Amphibole. This contaminated soil was spread out on
 > several sites.
 > I have witnessed EPA contractor crews dumping quite a bit of soil at
 > OU-1 recently. Fences have also been erected at various spots on this
 > site seemingly without any specific criteria. It has been a very
 > willy-nilly program.
 > Can you assure me that the soil used to temporarily cover visible
 > vermiculite that has laid in the open for years at OU-1 was not the
 > contaminated restoration or cover material that I have been reading
 > about?
 > If it is, what are the ramifications for public safety in this public
 > park to exposed contaminant blowing in the wind?
 > Thank you for your consideration of this important matter.
 > Sincerely, Councilman DC Orr; (Public Safety Coordinator)
 >
 > The New Busy think 9 to 5 is a cute idea. Combine multiple calendars
 > with Hotmail. Get busy.
 >

The New Busy is not the too busy. Combine all your e-mail accounts with Hotmail. Get busy.